

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/043,433	•	01/07/1999	DAVID D. MUNDSCHENK	15050.4.2	6740	
22859	7590	02/23/2005		EXAMINER		
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP FREDRIKSON & BYRON, P.A.				GEORGE, KONATA M		
200 SOUTI		,		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SUITE 400	0			1616		
MINNEAP	OLIS, M	N 55402		DATE MAILED: 02/23/200	DATE MAILED: 02/23/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary	09/043,433	MUNDSCHENK, DAVID D.	
omoc Aouon Gummary	Examiner	Art Unit	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a	Konata M. George	1616	
Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIOI  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by sta Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the may earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a repreply within the statutory minimum of thirty od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTI tute, cause the application to become ABA	ly be timely filed  30) days will be considered timely.  IS from the mailing date of this communication.  NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25	October 2004.	•	
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ▼ T	his action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	•	• •	
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) <u>1,5-8,11-18,22,23 and 27-29</u> is/are 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) <u>1, 5-8, 11-18, 22, 23 and 27-29</u> is/a 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	awn from consideration. are rejected.		
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam			
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ a	ccepted or b) objected to by	the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to t	<del>-</del>		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corr	•	· · ·	).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attached	Jinice Action or form P10-152.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a least	ents have been received. ents have been received in Ap riority documents have been re eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	olication No eceived in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)	<b></b>		
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)     Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		mmary (PTO-413) Mail Date	
<ol> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/Paper No(s)/Mail Date</li> </ol>		ormal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Art Unit: 1616

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 1, 5-8, 11-18, 22, 23 and 27-29 are pending in this application.

## **Action Summary**

- 1. Examiner acknowledges the cancellation of claim 2-4 and 21. Therefore, any and all rejections and/or objections directed towards them are hereby withdrawn.
- 2. The rejection of claims 1, 5 and 6 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-5, 14, 16 and 18 of US Patent No. 5,665,332 is being maintained for the reasons stated in the previous office action dated July 21, 2004.

## **Double Patenting**

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 1, 5-8, 11-18, 22, 23 and 27-29 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable

over claims 1-8 are 11-18 of copending Application No. 10/405,100. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both copending applications are directed to a system of delivering a chemical agent in the form of a spray or stable foam. The only difference between the two-copending applications is the recitation of instant application which is the limitation that the formulation is stored as a single composition. While it is not specifically taught in 10/405,100, that the composition is stored as a single composition, the claim language is broad enough to encompass all storage types i.e. single compartment, dual compartment, etc.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

#### Conclusion

4. Claims 1, 5-8, 11-18, 22, 23 and 27-29 are rejected.

## Telephone Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Konata M. George, whose telephone number is (571) 272-0613. The examiner can normally be reached from 8AM to 6:30PM Monday to Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Kunz, can be reached at (571) 272-0887. The fax phone numbers for

Application/Control Number: 09/043,433

Art Unit: 1616

Page 4

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Konata M. George

CARY KUNZ

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600